

A Large Π_2^1 Set, Absolute for Set Forcings

Sy D. Friedman*
M.I.T.

The purpose of this note is to prove the following.

Theorem. *Let κ be an L -cardinal, definable in L . Then there is a set of reals X , class-generic over L , such that*

- (a) $L(X) \models \text{Card} = \text{Card}^L$ and X has cardinality κ .
- (b) Some fixed Π_2^1 formula defines X in all set-generic extensions of $L(X)$.

By Lévy-Shoenfield Absoluteness, any Π_2^1 formula defining X in $L(X)$ defines a superset of X in each extension of $L(X)$. The point of (b) is that this superset is just X in set-generic extensions of $L(X)$. If $O^\#$ exists then X as in the Theorem actually exists in V , though of course it will be only countable there.

The basic idea of the proof comes from David [82]. In his paper a real R class-generic over L is produced so that $\{R\}$ is Π_2^1 , uniformly for set-generic extensions of $L(R)$. The added technique here is to use “diagonal supports” to take a large product of David-style forcings.

Here are some further applications of the Theorem and its proof.

Corollary 1. *Assume consistency of an inaccessible cardinal. Then it is consistent for the Perfect Set Property to hold for Σ_2^1 sets yet fail for some Π_2^1 set.*

Proof. Using the Theorem get a Π_2^1 set X which has cardinality κ in $L(X)$, κ = least L -inaccessible, and which has a Π_2^1 -definition uniform for set-generic extensions. Then gently collapse κ to ω_1 and add ω_2 Cohen reals. In this extension, $\omega_1 > \omega_1^{L(R)}$ for each real R and X is a Π_2^1 set of cardinality $\omega_1 < \omega_2 = 2^{\aleph_0}$. $\dashv$

Corollary 2. *Assume consistency of an inaccessible. Then it is consistent that the Perfect Set Property holds for Σ_2^1 sets and there is a Π_2^1 well ordering of some set of reals of length $\aleph_{1000}$.*

*Research supported by NSF contract #9205530-DMA.

The latter answers a question of Harrington.

The Proof.

We modify the construction of David [82] to suit our purposes. First we describe the α^+ -Souslin tree T_α in L , where α is a successor L -cardinal: T_α has a unique node on level 0 and exactly 2 immediate successors on level $\beta + 1$ to each node on level β , for $\beta < \alpha^+$. If $\beta < \alpha^+$ is a limit of cofinality $< \alpha$ then level β assigns a top to each branch through the tree below level β . Now suppose $\beta < \alpha^+$ has cofinality α . Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the forcing consisting of pairs (γ, f) where $\gamma < \beta$ and f is a function from γ into the nodes at levels $< \beta$, with extension defined by $(\gamma', f') \leq (\gamma, f)$ iff $\gamma' \geq \gamma$, $f'(\delta)$ tree-extends $f(\delta)$ for each $\delta < \gamma$. Choose G to be $\mathcal{P}$ -generic over L_{β^*} where $\beta^* =$ largest p.r. closed $\beta^* \geq \beta$ such that $\beta^* = \beta$ or $L_{\beta^*} \models \text{card}(\beta) > \alpha$. Then the nodes on level β are obtained by putting tops on the branches defined by $\{f(\delta) \mid (\gamma, f) \in G \text{ some } \gamma\}$ for $\delta < \beta$. This completes the definition of the α^+ -Souslin tree T_α .

Now fix an L -definable cardinal κ and also fix an L -definable $1 - 1$ function $F : \kappa \times \omega \times \text{ORD} \longrightarrow \text{Successor } L\text{-cardinals greater than } \kappa$. The forcing $\mathcal{P}(\gamma, n)$, $\gamma < \kappa$ and $n < \omega$, is designed to produce a real $R(\gamma, n)$ coding branches through T_α whenever α is of the form $F(\gamma, n, \delta)$ for some δ . This forcing is obtained by modifying the Jensen coding of the empty class (see Beller-Jensen-Welch [82]) as follows: In defining the strings $s : [\alpha, |s|) \longrightarrow 2$ in S_α , require that $\text{Even}(s)$ code a branch through T_α if $\alpha \in \text{Card}(\gamma, n) = \{F(\gamma, n, \delta) \mid \delta \in \text{ORD}\}$. Also use David's trick to create a Π_2^1 condition implying that branches through the appropriate trees are coded: for any α , for s to belong to S_α require that for $\xi \leq |s|$ and $\eta > \xi$, if $L_\eta(s \restriction \xi) \models \xi = \alpha^+ + ZF^- + \text{Card} = \text{Card}^L$ then $L_\eta(s \restriction \xi) \models$ for some $\gamma^* < \kappa^*$, $\text{Even}(s \restriction \xi)$ codes a branch through $T_{\alpha^*}^*$ whenever $\alpha^* \in \text{Card}^*(\gamma^*, n)$, where κ^* , $T_{\alpha^*}^*$, $\text{Card}^*(\gamma^*, n)$ are defined in L_η as were $\kappa, T_\alpha, \text{Card}(\gamma, n)$ in L . The $\leq \alpha$ -distributivity of $\mathcal{P}(\gamma, n)_\alpha$ (= the forcing at and above α) is established as in David [82], with one added observation: if $\alpha' \in \text{Card}(\gamma, n)$ then we have to be sure that $\text{Even}(p_{\alpha'})$ codes a branch through $T_{\alpha'}$, where p arises as the greatest lower bound to an α -sequence constructed to meet α -many open dense sets. There is no problem if $\alpha' > \alpha$ since then $T_{\alpha'}$ is $\leq \alpha$ -closed. If $\alpha' = \alpha$ then the property follows from the definition of level $|p_\alpha|$ of T_α , since we can arrange that $\text{Even}(p_\alpha)$ is sufficiently generic for $T_\alpha \restriction (\text{levels} < |p_\alpha|)$. (In fact the latter genericity is a consequence of the usual

construction of the α -sequence leading to p .)

The forcing $\mathcal{P}(\gamma), \gamma < \kappa$, is designed to produce a real $R(\gamma)$ such that $n \in R(\gamma)$ iff $R(\gamma)$ codes a branch through T_α for each α in $\text{Card}(\gamma, n)$. A condition is $p \in \prod_n \mathcal{P}(\gamma, n)$ where $p(n)(0)$ (a finite object) is $(\emptyset, \emptyset)$ for all but finitely many n . Extension is defined by $q \leq p$ iff $q(n) \leq p(n)$ in $\mathcal{P}(\gamma, n)$ unless n is not of the form $2^{n_0}3^{n_1}$ or $n = 2^{n_0}3^{n_1}$ where $q(n_0)_0(n_1) = 0$, in which case there is no requirement on $q(n)$. A generic G can be identified with the real $\{2^n 3^m | p(n)_0(m) = 1 \text{ for some } p \in G\} = R(\gamma)$. The forcing at or above α , $\mathcal{P}(\gamma)_\alpha$, obeys “quasi-distributivity”: if $D_i, i < \alpha$ are predense below p then there are $q \leq p$ and $d_i \subseteq D_i, i < \alpha$ such that each d_i is countable and predense below q . This is established as in David [82] by “guessing at $\langle p(n)(0) | n \in \omega \rangle$ ” and yields cardinal preservation.

Our desired forcing $\mathcal{P}$ is the “diagonally supported” product of the $\mathcal{P}(\gamma), \gamma < \kappa$. Specifically, a condition is $p \in \prod_{\gamma < \kappa} \mathcal{P}(\gamma)$ where for infinite cardinals $\alpha < \kappa$, $\{\gamma | p(\gamma)(\alpha) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)\}$ has cardinality $\leq \alpha$ and in addition $\{\gamma | p(\gamma)(0) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)\}$ is finite. Quasi-distributivity for $\mathcal{P}_\alpha =$ forcing at or above α follows just as for $\mathcal{P}(\gamma)_\alpha$. The point of the diagonal supports is that for infinite successor cardinals α , $\mathcal{P}$ factors as $\mathcal{P}_\alpha * \mathcal{P}^{G_\alpha}$ where G_α denotes the $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ -generic and $\mathcal{P}^{G_\alpha}$ is $\alpha^+ - CC$. Thus we get cardinal-preservation.

Now note that if $\langle R(\gamma) | \gamma < \kappa \rangle$ comes from (and therefore determines) a $\mathcal{P}$ -generic then $n \in R(\gamma) \longrightarrow R(\gamma)$ codes a branch through T_α for α in $\text{Card}(\gamma, n)$. Conversely, if $n \notin R(\gamma)$ then there is no condition on extension of conditions in $\mathcal{P}(\gamma)$ to cause $R(\gamma)$ to code a branch through such T_α . In fact, by the quasi-distributivity argument for $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$, given any term τ for a subset of α^+ and any condition p , we can find $\beta < \alpha^+$ of cofinality α and $q \leq p$ such that q forces $\tau \cap \beta$ to be one of α -many possibilities, each constructed before β^* , where $\beta = |q_\alpha|$. Thus q forces that τ is *not* a branch through T_α , so we get: $n \in R(\gamma)$ iff $R(\gamma)$ codes a branch through each T_α , $\alpha \in \text{Card}(\gamma, n)$ iff $R(\gamma)$ codes a branch through some T_α , $\alpha \in \text{Card}(\gamma, n)$. The coding is localized in the sense that if $n \in R(\gamma)$ then whenever $L_\eta(R(\gamma)) \models ZF^- + \text{Card} = \text{Card}^L$, there is $\gamma^* < \kappa^*$ such that $L_\eta(R(\gamma)) \models R(\gamma)$ codes a branch through $T_{\alpha^*}^*$ whenever $\alpha^* \in \text{Card}^*(\gamma^*, n)$, where $\kappa^*, T_{\alpha^*}^*, \text{Card}^*(\gamma^*, n)$ are defined in L_η just as $\kappa, T_\alpha, \text{Card}(\gamma^*, n)$ are defined in L . The latter condition on $R(\gamma)$ is sufficient to know that $R(\gamma)$ is equal to one of the intended $R(\gamma), \gamma < \kappa$, even if we restrict

ourselves to countable η . With that restriction we get a Π_2^1 condition equivalent to membership in $X = \{R(\gamma) \mid \gamma < \kappa\}$. Since set-forcing preserves the Souslin-ness of trees at sufficiently large cardinals, the above Π_2^1 definition of X works in any set-generic extension of $L(X)$. This completes the proof of the Theorem.

Proof of Corollary 2. As in the proof of Corollary 1 we can obtain $X = \{R(\gamma) \mid \gamma < \kappa\}$, $\kappa = 999^{\text{th}}$ cardinal after the least L -inaccessible, which has a Π_2^1 definition uniform for set-generic extensions of $L(X)$, where $\text{Card}^{L(X)} = \text{Card}^L$. We can guarantee that $Y = \{\langle R(0), R(\gamma_1), R(\gamma_2) \rangle \mid 0 < \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 < \kappa\}$ also has such a uniform Π_2^1 definition, using the following trick: Design $R(0)$ so that $u \in R(0) \iff \text{Even}(R(0))$ codes a branch through T_α for each α in $\text{Card}(0, n)$, and so that $\text{Odd}(R_0)$ almost disjointly codes $\{\langle R(\gamma_1), R(\gamma_2) \rangle \mid 0 < \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 < \kappa\}$. Thus, for $R \in L(X)$, R^* is almost disjoint from $\text{Odd}(R_0)$ iff $R = \langle R(\gamma_1), R(\gamma_2) \rangle$ for some $0 < \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 < \kappa$, where $R^* = \{n \mid n \text{ codes a finite initial segment of } R\}$. The former requires only a very small modification to the definition of the $\mathcal{P}(0)$ forcings. The latter requires only a small modification to the definition of $\mathcal{P}$: take the diagonally-supported product as before, but restrain $p(0)$ for $p \in \mathcal{P}$ so as to affect the desired almost disjoint coding. These finite restraints do not interfere with the quasi-distributivity argument for $\mathcal{P}$.

Now we have the desired Π_2^1 definition for $Y = \{\langle R(0), R(\gamma_1), R(\gamma_2) \rangle \mid 0 < \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 < \kappa\}$: R belongs to Y iff $R = \langle R_0, R_1, R_2 \rangle$ where $R_0 = R(0)$ and $\langle R_1, R_2 \rangle^*$ is almost disjoint from R_0 and R_1, R_2 belong to X . Since $R(0)$ is uniformly definable as a Π_2^1 -singleton in set-generic extensions of $L(X)$, this is the desired definition. Of course, using Y we obtain a Π_2^1 well-ordering of length κ . Finally as in the proof of Corollary 1, gently collapse κ to ω_1 and we have $\omega_1 > \omega_1^{L(R)}$ for each real R with a Π_2^1 well-ordering of length $\aleph_{1000}$. $\dashv$

Remarks. The same proof gives length $\aleph_\alpha$ for any L -definable α . We can also add Cohen reals so that the continuum is as large as desired, without changing the maximum length of a Π_2^1 well-ordering.

It is possible to show that if $O^\#$ exists then there is a Π_2^1 set X such that X has large cardinality in $L(X)$. But this requires the more difficult technique of Friedman [90].

REFERENCES

- [82] Beller-Jensen-Welch, *Coding The Universe*, Cambridge University Press.
- [82] David, *A Very Absolute Π_2^1 -Singleton*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **23**.
- [90] Friedman, *The Π_2^1 -Singleton Conjecture*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society **3**,
Number 4.
- [77] Harrington, *Long Projective Well orderings*, Annals of Mathematical Logic **12**.